

Page 5

Remarks

This is filed in response to the Office Action mailed August 2, 2004, citing minor formal objections to claim 1, rejecting claims 19 – 25 as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 101, and rejecting claims 1 – 12 and 18 – 25 as allegedly anticipated by Jennings (US 6717593), and rejecting claims 13 - 17 as allegedly obvious over Jennings in view of Rush (US 6622144). The amendments above, combined with the remarks, attend to all grounds for rejection, thereby, placing this application in condition for allowance.

At the outset, responding to ¶1 of the Office Action, claim 1 is amended to correct the punctuation as suggested by the Examiner.

Responding ¶2 of the Office Action, claims 19 – 25 are amended to better insure recitation of patentable subject matter. Specifically, independent claim 19 is amended to recite that the enumerated elements are executed on a digital data processor.

Responding to ¶3 of the Office Action, the Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to distinguish the claimed method still further from the cited publication, Jennings. As so amended, that independent claim recites the steps of building a parser using an automated parser generator tool that accepts a source input file containing a predefined grammar; scanning a markup-language stream and/or document object model (DOM) to generate tokens; and parsing the tokens using the parser to identify one or more user interface (UI) objects.

Nowhere does Jennings suggest such a methodology. That publication is directed to a mark-up language implementation that provides for implementing user interfaces independent of the particular type of user interface (e.g., graphical or aural). Nowhere does the publication teach or suggest building a parser generator, e.g., using an automated parser generator whose output is based on a predefined grammar. Nor does the publication teach or suggest parsing tokens from a mark-up language stream using such a parser. The portions of the Jennings specification that the Examiner cites to the contrary, i.e., at column 7 of that publication mentions DOMs; however, there is no mention of a parser to parse same — much less, one based on an automatic parser generator.

The secondary reference fails to remedy those deficiencies of Jennings. Although the Examiner cites Rush for the proposition that it would be obvious to use an automated parser generator to parse DOMs, as suggested in claim 1, there is no factual basis for that assertion. Only

Page 6

through hindsight reconstruction and, particularly, knowledge of the present applicants invention would such a connection be evident. The Examiner cites nothing to the contrary, merely, relying on assertion. For these reasons, the rejection fails.

This responds in full the Office Action mailed August 2, 2004. Recitation cited as objectionable is corrected as suggested by the Examiner. Claims recited as falling outside the scope of 35 U.S.C. 101 is amended to clarify same. Finally, the claimed subject matter is shown to be patentably distinct from the cited art. In view hereof, the objections and rejections should be withdrawn so that this application can pass forward to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,
NUTTER, McLENNEN & FISH, LLP



David J. Powsner
Reg. No. 31,868

Attorney for Applicant
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210-2604
Tel: (617)439-2717
Fax: (617)310-9717